



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                                                                                                                               | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/692,768                                                                                                                                    | 10/24/2003  | John R. Moore        | FA1196USNA              | 8947             |
| 23906                                                                                                                                         | 7590        | 06/29/2004           | EXAMINER                |                  |
| E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY<br>LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER<br>BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128<br>4417 LANCASTER PIKE<br>WILMINGTON, DE 19805 |             |                      | MICHENER, JENNIFER KOLB |                  |
|                                                                                                                                               |             |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                                                                                                                                               |             |                      | 1762                    |                  |
| DATE MAILED: 06/29/2004                                                                                                                       |             |                      |                         |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/692,768

Applicant(s)


MOORE ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer K. Michener

Art Unit

1762



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/23/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1 and 3-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 claims a method for predicting painting parameters so that predetermined painting responses are produced. This method would appear to require knowledge of a desired painting response to calculate the required painting parameters to use to achieve that response. However, the claim steps are directed to using the model of step a) to receive a predetermined painting parameter of step b) from which to determine the painting response of step c) in order to apply the parameters in step d) to achieve the desired response. This is unclear. The preamble is directed to determining parameters based on a desired response, however the claim steps are directed to determining a response based on desired parameters.

Examiner notes that the language of claim 2 is more clear and in line with its preamble and has basis in the specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –  
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Slusarczyk (6,064,919).

Slusarczyk teaches a method for predicting and applying painting parameters/factors to achieve desired painting responses. Slusarczyk uses a parameter-response models which interrelate painting factors with responses. The model can determine a painting factor from a painting response or a painting response from a painting factor, for use in applying the painting factors to achieve the painting response desired (abstract; col. 2, lines 1-20), as required by claims 1-2.

Slusarczyk's model may be based upon experiments (col. 3, line 67; col. 1, line 55) and may determine setpoints.

Slusarczyk's model may handle a plurality of factors and responses, with one factor being equipment conditions, inherently allowing comparison thereof, and the responses including film build, along with width and pattern, which affect shape (throughout; col. 4).

Art Unit: 1762

The method of Slusarczyk has a computer-human interface for inputting the above responses, etc. (col. 3, line 35).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1762

8. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slusarczyk.

Slusarczyk teaches various painting responses in a non-exhaustive list, as outlined above, but fails to specifically teach transfer efficiency as one of the responses.

However, examiner notes that efficiency of the transfer of paint in a painting operation would have been a variable one of ordinary skill in the art would have desired to optimize. Given the flexibility of Slusarczyk's model and his teaching that his list is not limited to those exemplary responses listed (col. 4, line 16), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the method and model of Slusarczyk to achieve a desired level of efficiency as a well-known manufacturing parameter requirement.


### ***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer K. Michener whose telephone number is (571) 272-1424. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive P. Beck can be reached on 571-272-1415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1762

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jennifer Kolb Michener  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1700  
6/26/2004